



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/009,698	12/05/2001	Victoria Pope	6395-61750	1330
24197	7590	04/22/2004	EXAMINER	
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP 121 SW SALMON STREET SUITE 1600 PORTLAND, OR 97204			SHAHNAN SHAH, KHATOL S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

10/009,698

Applicant(s)

POPE ET AL.

Examiner

Khatol S Shahnan-Shah

Art Unit

1645

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112 second rejection.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.Claim(s) objected to: None.Claim(s) rejected: 1-8, 11-17 and 20-27.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1645

***Attachment to Advisory Action***

1. Applicants' amendment B and response to final action, under 37 CFR 1.116, received 3/05/2004 is acknowledged. The amendment has been entered. Claims 3, 5-8, 12, 14, 16, 17, 22-25 and 27 have been amended.
2. Currently claims 1-8, 11-17 and 20-27 are pending and under consideration.

***Rejections Withdrawn***

3. Rejection of claims 3, 5-8, 14, 16-17 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph made in paragraph 14 of the office action mailed 11/23/2003, is withdrawn in view of applicants' amendments.
4. Rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph made in paragraph 18 of the office action mailed 11/23/2003, is withdrawn in view of applicants' amendments.

***Rejections Maintained***

5. Rejections of claims 1-8, 11-17 and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) made in paragraphs 15, 16, 19 and 20 of the office action mailed 11/23/2003, are maintained for the reasons of record.

Applicant's arguments filed 3/5/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue:

- a) Applicants argue unexpectedly superior results.
- b) Prior art teaches away from using synthetic cardiolipin and lecithin (exhibit A).
- c) Equivalency must be recognized in the prior art (MPEP 2144.06).

It is the examiner's position that the claimed composition and method are obvious over prior

Art Unit: 1645

of the record.

a) In regard to applicants claimed unexpectedly superior results MPEP 2145 recites “ Argument does not replace evidence where evidence is necessary”. The arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. In re Schulze, 346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965); In re Geisler, 116 F.3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (“An assertion of what seems to follow from common experience is just attorney argument and not the kind of factual evidence that is required to rebut a prima facie case of obviousness.”). See MPEP § 716.01(c) for examples of attorney statements which are not evidence and which must be supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration.

b) Applicants’ exhibit A as used is dated 1956, which cannot reflect the status of the prior art at the time the invention was made. In contrary the status of the prior art at the time invention was made (6/8/2000) encourages use of synthetic cardiolipin and lecithin in diagnosis of Syphilis (see attached article).

c) MPEP 2144.06 recites Art Recognized Equivalence for the Same Purpose or combining equivalents known for the same purpose. MPEP further recites: “It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art.” In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980) (citations omitted) (Claims to a process of preparing a spray-dried detergent by mixing together two conventional spray-dried

Art Unit: 1645

detergents were held to be prima facie obvious.). See also *In re Crockett*, 279 F.2d 274, 126 USPQ 186 (CCPA 1960) (Claims directed to a method and material for treating cast iron using a mixture comprising calcium carbide and magnesium oxide were held unpatentable over prior art disclosures that the aforementioned components individually promote the formation of a nodular structure in cast iron.); and *Ex parte Quadranti*, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992) (mixture of two known herbicides held prima facie obvious). But see *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686, 2 USPQ2d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (“Based upon the prior art and the fact that each of the three components of the composition used in the claimed method is conventionally employed in the art for treating cooling water systems, the board held that it would have been prima facie obvious, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103, to employ these components in combination for their known functions and to optimize the amount of each additive....

### ***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khatol S Shahnan-Shah whose telephone number is (571)-272-0863. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette F Smith can be reached on (571)-272-0864. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1645

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).




Khatol Shahnan-Shah, BS, Pharm, MS

Biotechnology Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1645

April 18, 2004



RODNEY P. SWARTZ, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER